



*OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS*  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

3 North Lowell Road, Windham, New Hampshire 03087  
(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362  
[www.WindhamNH.gov](http://www.WindhamNH.gov)

**Planning Board Workshop Draft Minutes**

September 9th, 2020

7:00 pm at Community Development Meeting Room & Zoom Video Conference  
3 North Lowell Road

**Attendance:**

Chair, Derek Monson, Present  
Vice Chair, Alan Carpenter, Present at 7:05  
Joe Bradley, Present, via Zoom video conferencing  
Jennean Mason, Present  
Ruth-Ellen Post, Present, via Zoom video conference  
Jacob Cross, Present, via Zoom video conference  
Matt Rounds (alternate), Present until 7:50pm, via Zoom video conference  
Gabe Toubia (alternate), Present, via Zoom video conference  
Tom Early (alternate), Present, via Zoom video conference  
Heath Partington, Board of Selectmen liaison, Present, via Zoom video conference  
Dick Gregory- Planning Board Director  
Renee Mallett- Minute Taker

The workshop opened at 7:00pm with the introduction of members. On March 23<sup>rd</sup>, because of the Covid-19 pandemic, Governor Sununu created Emergency Order #12. This has relaxed the requirements of RSA 91-A, III(c) and allowed the meeting to be held while still following the CDC guidelines for social distancing. As such many of the board members took part in the meeting via Zoom video conference.

**Case 2019-32 Major WPOD, (Lot 17-L-104) 23 Sawyer Road**

Case 2019-02 was previously approved with the condition that major site work would be completed by 09-01-2020. The applicant, as represented by Mr. Joseph Maynard, is asking for a 90-day extension due to construction delays caused by the Covid-19 pandemic.

Ms. Post asked when the applicant expected the sitework to be completed. Mr. Maynard said the applicant was hoping to seed by mid-October but acknowledged that it was an unusual year and hard to predict.

**Vice Chair Carpenter was seated at 7:05pm.**

Mr. Rounds said he did not see an issue with an extension in general but asked if the ground freezing would halt the rest of the work. Mr. Maynard said the applicant expected the bulk of the sitework to be completed before the weather turned.

Mr. Partington referenced an RSA that gave the Planning Board the power to request a third-party review of the site and said he thought it was applicable in this situation. Vice Chair Carpenter said that he did not find 90 days to be an unusual length of time for an extension and during a pandemic delays were to be expected. He did not know if there was really anything to be reviewed at this point. He asked if there were any drainage structures in place. Mr. Maynard said that the site relied on sheet drainage only.

Mr. Cross said he did not see any reason to deny the extension, but he liked the idea of a review.

Ms. Post asked if anything else in the original approval would be in conflict if the extension were granted. Mr. Maynard said he was not asking for any changes to the original approval, the applicant just needed more time to finish what had been approved.

Mr. Partington asked about erosion on the parcel. Mr. Gregory said he did not see erosion issues so far and that silt fences were in place.

Mr. Cross noticed a discrepancy between the agenda listing and the site map. Vice Chair Carpenter said that this was not a public hearing, so the decision did not have to be held due to the typo. He did question if the board could extend a deadline that had passed the week previous. Vice Chair Carpenter thought that the matter might have to be posted as public hearing and corrected by amending the former approval due to the signed mylars. Mr. Maynard said that as a major watershed application there were no mylars. In that case Vice Chair Carpenter said it counted as a strictly administrative issue and it could be simply extended.

**Vice Chair Carpenter made a motion to approve the extension of the timeframe to complete sitework for Case 2019-32 to December 1, 2020. Ms. Mason seconded the motion. Mr. Partington said he would oppose the motion as it did not include a requirement for a third-party review. Vice Chair Carpenter amended the motion to include a review by Mr. Keach within 45 days. Mr. Maynard asked what Mr. Keach would review. Mr. Partington said he did not think the project was trending in the right direction and he did not want to see another request for an extension on November 30<sup>th</sup>. The motion passed, 7-0, with the following roll-call vote:**

**Chair Monson: yes**

**Vice Chair Carpenter: yes**

**Mr. Bradley: yes**

**Ms. Mason: yes**

**Ms. Post: yes**

**Mr. Cross: yes**

**Mr. Partington: yes**

The board moved on to discussion of the draft Vision Statement for the Master Plan, as written by Mr. Rounds. Chair Monson said he thought it was a good start that could be easily revised once more information came in from the town wide survey. He suggested adding in improving communication with conservation focused organizations and questioned the walkability mention as it referenced a walking path from Griffin Park to the town beach but that was a state road.

Vice Chair Carpenter thanked Mr. Rounds for his work and asked to see an unedited or strikethrough version of the statement. Mr. Rounds said he wrote this statement from scratch and it was not revised from a previous document.

Mr. Cross liked the specificity used in the document and liked the inclusion of the footnotes. Mr. Rounds mentioned the possibility of adding a map to clarify what kinds of developments were being mentioned for what parts of town.

Ms. Post commended Mr. Rounds for his work but was concerned that the survey results might end up negating much of it. Mr. Rounds said that the document could be easily updated and that he based what

90 had been written on 20 years of heavily consistent data from the voters. Mr. Bradley called it a great  
91 template to which the board could later plug in the survey data.

92 Mr. Partington also thanked Mr. Rounds and said it was a straightforward, no nonsense, start. He  
93 was disappointed that so much of the data was five years or more old and still needed to be worked on. Mr.  
94 Rounds said going forward he would be looking to create consistency between the chapters as in the  
95 current Master Plan it was obvious that different groups had worked on different chapters.

96 Chair Monson said that the survey would be live from October 5<sup>th</sup> to November 5<sup>th</sup>.  
97

98 **Mr. Rounds excused himself at 7:50 from the remainder of the meeting.**  
99

100 Ms. Mason brought up her concerns that after the last meeting she drove past a new Dunkin  
101 Donuts sign that had been approved only minutes before. Chair Monson said it was a waste of the board's  
102 time to discuss and approve a sign that was already in place. Ms. Mason asked how this happened, how it  
103 could be fixed, and what would prevent this situation from happening again in the future.

104 Mr. Gregory said that the consequence of building before board approval was to pay double the  
105 application fee. Chair Monson asked if the board could require the sign be taken down.

106 Vice Chair Carpenter said that on top of building before approval the applicant had submitted  
107 designs and locations for only two signs while five were created. He added that per the ordinance the  
108 vacant storefront next to the one in question would have to have matching signage. He would like to have  
109 the applicant come before the board. Vice Chair Carpenter said there was also some question as to if the  
110 sign was internally illuminated, which is not allowed within the zoning.

111 Mr. Bradley asked if the planning department was aware that the signs were being built before  
112 approval was given. Mr. Gregory said he was aware that the sign company was there, and he told the  
113 applicant the sign was not approved. Mr. Gregory said code enforcement oversees sign permits.

114 The board asked that the applicant and the code enforcement officer speak with them at the next  
115 meeting.  
116

117 Vice Chair Carpenter suggested to Mr. Karl Dubay that he and the owner of Gateway Park meet  
118 with the board in the future. Vice Chair Carpenter said he knew most of that development was planned to  
119 be offices and he was concerned that it would be some time before that kind of development started up  
120 again because of Covid.

121 Mr. Dubay said he had some ideas for the park and would like to discuss them with the board at a  
122 later date.  
123

124 Mr. Dubay also submitted a one-page memo regarding allowing for school and school related uses  
125 within the light industrial zone. He said those uses are allowed in most other districts. Chair Monson asked  
126 Mr. Gregory to email a copy of the memo to everyone on the board.

127 Mr. Cross asked if school uses could also apply to daycares. Mr. Dubay said that daycares were  
128 currently allowed but that if the facility got a school license for supplemental services they would need to  
129 apply for a variance. Vice Chair Carpenter said the discussion should be tabled until it was a properly posted  
130 agenda item.  
131

132 The board reviewed possible other warrant articles. Mr. Bradley said that he had reviewed the  
133 existing WWPd regulations and compared them to the suggested language from Mr. Keach. Mr. Bradley  
134 thought the existing ones were more comprehensive. He said if anything the current regulations should be  
135 adjusted rather than replaced.  
136

137 **Mr. Partington excused himself from the remainder of the meeting.**

Chair Monson said that the pond associations were interested in being added to a WPOD workshop in the future. He would also like the board to look at existing setback regulations, which in a previous case would allow for two 10X10 sheds to be built within 15 feet of a property line but would not allow one 10X12.

Mr. Bradley brought up density bonuses in the 55+ housing ordinance. Mr. Cross said density was an issue across the board. Vice Chair Carpenter said Open Space should be included in that discussion as it would be in the community's favor to make some small changes there. He suggested that restricting the WWPD from calculations would do a lot to curb density in all the districts under review.

Circling back to the matter of the Dunkin' Donuts sign Vice Chair Carpenter said, if it were internally illuminated, that the light be turned off until the board had their discussion with the applicant. Ms. Post said she would like to research what penalty structures are in place in other towns when similar issues arose. Chair Monson said it could also be discussed with Attorney Campbell.

Mr. Cross said he did not know if it was a matter of punishment or a lack of enforcement. He felt that Mr. Gregory had given his blessing. Ms. Post said they were not mutually exclusive issues, and both punishment and enforcement should be looked at.

**Ms. Mason made a motion to approve the minutes of 8-5-20, with the amendment of using the term WPOD instead of WWPD in line 87. Mr. Cross seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-0, with the following roll-call vote:**

**Chair Monson: yes**

**Vice Chair Carpenter: yes**

**Mr. Bradley: yes**

**Ms. Mason: yes**

**Ms. Post: yes**

**Mr. Cross: yes**

**Ms. Mason made a motion to approve the minutes of 8-12-20, with the amendment to strike the Pledge of Allegiance from the opening of the meeting. The motion passed, 5-0-1, with Ms. Post abstaining as she was not present for the meeting, with the following roll-call vote:**

**Chair Monson: yes**

**Vice Chair Carpenter: yes**

**Mr. Bradley: yes**

**Ms. Mason: yes**

**Ms. Post: abstain**

**Mr. Cross: yes**

**At 8:58 Vice Chair Carpenter made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Mason seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-0, with the following roll-call vote:**

**Chair Monson: yes**

**Vice Chair Carpenter: yes**

**Mr. Bradley: yes**

**Ms. Mason: yes**

**Ms. Post: yes**

**Mr. Cross: yes**